

REMARKS

Claims 7-9, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi (US 2002/0093600) in view of Gee-Sung et al. (US 5,998,230) and Kim et al. (US 5,731,856). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Final Office Action acknowledges that “Choi fails to specifically disclose that the active layer is patterned concurrently with the transparent conductive film.” Accordingly, the Final Office Action relies upon Gee-Sung et al. for allegedly teaching “in Column 4 lines 32-39 of patterning the active layer simultaneously with the conductive layer for forming the drain and source.” Thus, the Final Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to “fabricate a liquid crystal display device as taught by Choi wherein the channel layer and the ohmic contact layer is formed in the same step as forming the drain and source electrodes as taught by Gee-Sung et al., since Gee-Sung et al. teach that simultaneously patterning a plurality of films reduces the number of photo masks thus helps in reducing production costs and shortening the production speed (Column 4, lines 45-52).” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, Applicant respectfully asserts that Gee-Sung et al. is completely silent with regard to any simultaneous patterning of a transparent conductive film and an active layer. Specifically, Gee-Sung et al. repeatedly discloses formation of pixel electrodes 30 well after patterning of the a-Si semiconductive films 38. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully assert that Gee-Sung et al. fails to remedy the admitted deficiencies of Choi, and thus, clearly fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to at least independent claim 7.

Second, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kim et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Choi and Gee-Sung et al., as detailed above. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the Final Office Action further fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to at least independent claim 7.

Third, a pixel electrode is not formed from a second conductive film in Gee-Sung; the second conductive film forms only a source/drain electrode in Gee-Sung. However, in the present case, not only is a pixel electrode formed, but also a source/drain electrode is formed from a transparent conductive film in claim 7. Accordingly, additional processes may be required to form the pixel electrode.

Fourth, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Choi, Gee-Sung et al., and Kim et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest at least Applicants' claimed feature of "patterning the active layer and the transparent conductive film to concurrently form a data bus line, a data pad, a source electrode, a drain electrode, a pixel electrode, a channel layer, and an ohmic contact layer," as recited by independent claim 7.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-13 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy

Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: December 5, 2006

Customer Number: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004

202-739-3000